

are selling stock to pay for their children's tuition.

We are not denying that there should be the opportunity for children to go to college, but what we want to distinguish is how the middle-income, the working family, does not get the same equal benefit. I think that is just key in what we are trying to do here.

There are various loopholes about how this capital gains transfer by the richer family being able to give the stocks over to the children, getting a benefit, and then the children being able to sell it and use it for college, that does not happen when hard-working middle-income families just want to sell a few mutual funds, they do not get the same benefit as the richer population.

I think that is extremely important, as well as, let me add, the fact that this is a 422-page bill. I noted that part of it has reporting requirements for unions. This is a complex set of new laws that are coming into being.

I always thought that one of the things that we in Congress wanted to do was to simplify the Tax Code, to simplify the process, and to allow those working families and small businesses to be able to pay taxes and to have taxes cut or tax relief in a simplified process. That is not the case with this new 422-page proposal offered by the Republicans.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we do not have much time, but if I could just summarize, I think we pretty much pointed out first of all why the Democratic tax cut alternative is fairer, because it essentially targets tax cuts on those who need them.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], we are talking about scarce resources here. This is a balanced budget plan. We want to give tax cuts where they are needed. That is really essentially what the Democrats are all about: making it fair, making it primarily for those who need them. It is obviously a lot better for working families.

We talked about the per-child tax credit. We talked about how it is better for education, because it gives more money to people who have the need, whether they are in the first 2 years of college or they are in 4 years of college, whether they are in graduate education.

Lastly, and certainly no less important, is it is so much better with regard to the deficit. I think there is the really telling point, if you will, when I talk to my constituents. When they listen to what the gentleman from Washington said, if we go through this process and at the end of this process, 10 years from now, we end up with an even larger deficit than we have now, basically we are lying to the American people.

Ms. DELAURO. Shame on us.

Mr. PALLONE. That cannot be. We just have to keep pointing it out every day on the floor, as we are doing now,

and hopefully ultimately our colleagues will listen and understand why the Democratic alternative is better.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the two gentlewomen for participating, but we are going to have to do this a lot more.

Ms. DELAURO. I think it is worth doing, and we thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue.

THE QUESTION OF RACE AND REMARKS BY PRESIDENT CLINTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there are many things that we come to the floor of the House to discuss, and many times we do have a difference of opinion, because this is the nature of the democratic process.

Allow me to speak very pointedly on an issue on which I am going to call for a bipartisan response and a joined and open-minded response that takes into consideration the intense feelings held by many in this Nation on this question. That is the question of race, and the remarks that were made by the President of the United States this past weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I do not view his remarks as being political, though I know the commentary has reached all levels of debate. I do find his words to be important and instructive, for it is noteworthy that we are only 3 years now away from the 21st century. His remarks, if summarized, asked America how they wished to be defined, whether we wanted to go into the 21st century being defined as a divided nation, a nation that could not help heal its wounds and heal the divisiveness.

So I want to applaud the President for calling to our attention the fact that now is the time, as was asked by Dr. Martin Luther King, if not now, then when, for us to come and speak clearly, resoundingly and positively, about bringing this Nation together. I applaud that.

I imagine that over the year's debate, with the commission that he has constructed to carry this forth, that there will be many points of view being raised.

□ 1915

In fact, I believe that there will be many groups that will further articulate what that means, action items, economic development, education of our children, the elimination of drug addiction in inner cities, rebuilding of our infrastructure, creating jobs, helping small businesses get access to capital. All of that will be part of the larger solution. But no one can take away from the importance of the problem and the importance of discussing the problem.

That is why I think it so very important to acknowledge this debate and

his raising of this debate and his proudness as well as courage in raising it comes the possibility of failure. Already so many have cast their lot on the failure side. I cast mine on the success side.

I would ask the Speaker and I would ask Members of this House that they rise up and support this effort in a bipartisan manner. Therefore, talk about color-blindness and eliminating affirmative action and legislation that is being announced to eliminate all Federal affirmative action should now be stopped itself; cease and desist, until a full discussion can be taken to determine whether or not now is the time to eliminate affirmative action. I would say resoundingly not. The facts are there. Eighty percent decrease in admissions in the University of California system. Not one single African-American admitted or accepted into the University of Texas School of Law. Let me say, accepted, but yet only one admitted and none attending in fall of 1997. So there is data to suggest that we do have a problem in making sure that women, African-Americans, Hispanics and Anglos, Asians, and others who come from diverse backgrounds are all in the circle.

There was an article noted in the Houston Chronicle on June 17, 1997, written by NEWT GINGRICH and Ward Connerly. They seemed to try to emphasize, in defending opposing affirmative action and as well not rising to the debate that would help bring us together, that other issues are important. Let me say that I agree that we must educate our children. Let me say that I agree that we must do other things, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that we bring us together.

But let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that we can do it by discussion and then solving the problem and, yes, we can do it by an apology. Let us work together to solve the problems of racial divide.

JUVENILE CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, tonight I come to talk for a few minutes wearing my hat as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Crime. The reason that I do is because I have been engaged in discussions over the past few days and several weeks, for that matter, with respect to juvenile crime, where we are going with it, why the bill H.R. 3 was shaped the way it was to reform the juvenile justice system, and what is going to happen generally in relationship to the whole issue of crime in the United States and drugs, which are present on the minds of most Americans on a rather continual basis unfortunately.

I thought that we should start this discussion for a minute by putting